arXiv:1302.7137v1 [hep-th] 28 Feb 2013

Preprint typeset in JHEP style - HYPER VERSION

IFT-UAM/CSIC-13-020;FTUAM-13-131

Unimodular Cosmological Space-times.

Enrique Álvarez ⋆ • and Mario Herrero-Valea •

⋆ *Physics Department. Theory Unit CERN 1211 Genève 23, Switzerland*
• *Instituto de Física Teórica UAM/CSIC and Departamento de Física Teórica*
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, E-28049–Madrid, Spain
E-mail: enrique.alvarez@uam.es mario.herrero@estudiante.uam.es

ABSTRACT: Some cosmological solutions of the unimodular theory of gravity are studied. These solutions can always be mapped to solutions of Einstein's general relativity in an appropiate frame. Constant scalar potentials however do not gravitate. Some physical consequences are pointed out.

Contents

1. Introduction. 1

2. Some common spacetimes in the unimodular frame. 2

3. Unimodular cosmological models. 3

4. Constant scalar potential 6

5. Conclusions 9

1. Introduction.

A radical approach towards explaining why (the zero mode of) the vacuum energy seems to violate the equivalence principle (the *active cosmological constant problem*) is just to eliminate the direct coupling in the action between the potential energy and the gravitational field [1]. This leads to consider unimodular theories, wheter the (absolute value of the) determinant of the metric is constrained to be constant in the Einstein frame. We shall represent this absolute value as g. The simplest nontrivial such unimodular action [1][2] when only a scalar matter field Φ is present [1]) reads

$$\begin{aligned} S \equiv \int d^n x \left(-M^{n-2}\ R_E + \frac{1}{2}\ g_E^{\mu\nu}\nabla_\mu\Phi\nabla_\nu\Phi - V(\Phi)\right) = \\ \int d^n x \left\{ g^{\frac{1}{n}} \left(-M^{n-2}\left(\ R + \frac{(n-1)(n-2)}{4n^2}\frac{g^{\mu\nu}\nabla_\mu g\ \nabla_\nu g}{g^2}\right) + \frac{1}{2}\ g^{\mu\nu}\nabla_\mu\Phi\nabla_\nu\Phi\right) - V(\Phi)\right\} \end{aligned}$$

where the n-dimensional Planck mass is related to the n-dimensional Newton constant through

$$M^{n-2} \equiv \frac{1}{16\pi G} \tag{1.1}$$

This theory is invariant under Weyl transformations (under which the Einstein metric is inert)

$$\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu} = \Omega^2(x) g_{\mu\nu}(x) \tag{1.2}$$

as well as under area preserving (transverse) diffeomorphisms, id est, those that enjoy unit jacobian, thereby preserving the Lebesgue measure.

The gravitational equations of motion derived from this action principle are

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{n}\ R\ g_{\mu\nu} = \frac{(n-2)(2n-1)}{4n^2}\left(\frac{\nabla_\mu g\nabla_\nu g}{g^2} - \frac{1}{n}\frac{(\nabla g)^2}{g^2}g_{\mu\nu}\right) - \\ \frac{n-2}{2n}\left(\frac{\nabla_\mu\nabla_\nu g}{g} - \frac{1}{n}\frac{\nabla^2 g}{g}g_{\mu\nu}\right) + \frac{M^{2-n}}{2}\left(\partial_\mu\Phi\partial_\nu\Phi - \frac{1}{n}\ g^{\alpha\beta}\partial_\alpha\Phi\partial_\beta\Phi\ g_{\mu\nu}\right) \end{aligned} \tag{1.3}$$

while the one for the scalar field is

$$\nabla^2\Phi + g^{-\frac{1}{n}}V'(\Phi) = \frac{n-2}{2n}\frac{\nabla\Phi.\nabla g}{g} \tag{1.4}$$

Other interesting approaches somewhat related to our own can be found in [3].

The purpose of the present work is to study how this fact, that the vacuum energy does not gravitate in Unimodular Gravity, constrains cosmological solutions using for them a simple toy model in which we only couple a scalar field to gravity. In order to do that, we will start by considering vacuum solutions in the unimodular frame ($g = 1$) and we will argue which is the most general form for an isotropic and homogeneus metric that enjoys unit determinant as well. With that ansatz, in section 3, we will derive the equations of motion and a first integral coming from Bianchi identities that will show us how to map unimodular solutions to those of General Relativity. Finally, in section 4, we will study a toy model in which the potential of the scalar field is constant and we will see how the Bianchi identity relates to the boundary conditions. This will show that this model is insensitive to shifts in the vacuum energy, at variance with General Relativity, where energy shifts imply the existence of a dynamical thin shell in order to avoid singularities in the matching hypersurface.

2. Some common spacetimes in the unimodular frame.

In the unimodular frame, the equations of motion of the vacuum Unimodular theory are greatly simplified and result to be just the equations of motion of the Eintein's second theory of gravity

$$R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{n} R g_{\mu\nu} = 0 \tag{2.1}$$

from which is clear that any maximally symmetric space is a solution of the theory. In our conventions, the Ricci tensor of such spaces reads

$$R_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{2}{n-2} \lambda g_{\mu\nu} \tag{2.2}$$

the metric of such spaces can be written in a manifestly conformally flat form by using Poincaré coordinates. For example, in the case of (anti-)de Sitter space, which in our convention enjoys (positive)negative curvature but (negative)positive cosmological constant, it reads

$$\textbf{dS}: \qquad d^2_{dS} = \frac{l^2 dz^2 - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (dy_i)^2}{z^2}; \quad R^{dS}_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{n-1}{l^2} g_{\mu\nu} \tag{2.3}$$

$$\textbf{AdS}: \qquad d^2_{AdS} = \frac{-l^2 dz^2 + (dy_1)^2 - \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} (dy_i)^2}{z^2}; \quad R^{AdS}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{n-1}{l^2} g_{\mu\nu} \tag{2.4}$$

All these spaces can be written in unimodular coordinates through a change of coordinates. For example, in the de Sitter case

$$\begin{aligned} z &= \left(\frac{1}{(n-1)u} \right)^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \\ y_i &= v_i \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

yielding

$$ds^2_{dS} = \left(l\frac{du}{(n-1)u}\right)^2 - ((n-1)u)^{\frac{2}{n-1}}\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} dv_i^2 \tag{2.6}$$

We shall call this choice of coordinates the *unimodular frame*. It can be always chosen in GR since it is a diffeomorphism and actually Einstein himself was quite fond of it. The powerlike growth of the de Sitter metric in this frame is a coordinate artifact. If one goes to the usual cosmic time $u = u_0 e^{\frac{n-1}{l}(t-t_0)}$, the scale factor would grow exponentially indeed. However, this diffeomorphism that maps unimodular time into cosmic time is not area preserving and thus it is not a symmetry of the Unimodular theory. This fact implies that the metric (2.6) written in unimodular and cosmic coordinates, which in GR are physically equivalent, correspond to two different physical solutions in our case.

The de Sitter example shows that it is quite easy to express general Friedman-Robertson-Walker metrics in the unimodular frame just by transforming coordinates in the same sense as above. If we have a general isotropic and homogeneus metric with flat spatial sections

$$ds^2 = dt^2 - a^2(t)\delta_{ij}dx^i dx^j \tag{2.7}$$

it is enough to redefine the time coordinate in order to have a unimodular metric. Thus

$$du = a^{n-1}(t)dt \tag{2.8}$$

where $a(t)$ is the scale factor of the FRW metric. By defining $dt = S^{-(n-1)}du$ we arrive to the most general form for a homogeneus and isotropic metric in the unimodular frame

$$ds^2 = S(u)^{-2(n-1)}du^2 - S^2(u)\delta_{ij}dx^i dx^j \tag{2.9}$$

In the rest of this work we shall stick to this metric form and work in unimodular coordinates.

3. Unimodular cosmological models.

The aim of the present paper is to study some homogeneus and isotropic cosmological models. We have just seen in the previous section that it is not possible to reach the synchronous gauge (cosmic time) while staying unimodular. We have to choose one or another and it is computationally preferable to keep the unimodularity condition giving up the $g_{00} = 1$ one since the equations of motion streamline enormously. We have seen that the simplest such metric which is also homogeneus and isotropic reads

$$ds^2 = S(u)^{-2(n-1)}du^2 - S^2(u)\delta_{ij}dx^i dx^j \tag{3.1}$$

If ones prefers to stick to the usual $g_{00} = 1$ choice of General Relativity and work in cosmic time, then all terms in the rhs of 1.3 have to be kept and computations are far more complicated than in the unimodular frame. That is the reason of why we choosed it. Besides, as stated before, the transformation from the synchronous frame to the unimodular one is not a symmetry of the theory since it is not area preserving.

Focusing on $n = 4$ dimensions for concreteness, the scalar curvature and the Ricci tensor derived from this metric read

$$\begin{aligned} R_{00} &= -3\frac{3\dot{S}^2 + s\ddot{S}}{S^2} && (3.2)\\ R_{ij} &= S^6(5\dot{S}^2 + S\ddot{S})\delta_{ij} \\ R &= -6S^4(4\dot{S}^2 + S\ddot{S}) && (3.3) \end{aligned}$$

so the traceless part of the Ricci tensor reads

$$\begin{aligned} R_{00} - \frac{1}{4}Rg_{00} &= -3\frac{\dot{S}^2}{S^2} - \frac{3}{2}\frac{\ddot{S}}{S} && (3.4)\\ R_{ij} - \frac{1}{4}Rg_{ij} &= -(S^6\dot{S}^2 + \frac{1}{2}S^7\ddot{S})\delta_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

Let us now consider, as stated in the introduction, the action for a scalar field with some undetermined potential $V(\Phi)$ coupled to unimodular gravity. This leads in GR to simple cosmological toy models from which one can see the efect of vacuum energy as a source for the cosmological constant. However, in unimodular gravity, such a cosmological term is forbidden and pure vacuum energy seems to not gravitate, what makes studying these models interesting in this theory. The action for such a system, in four dimensions, reads

$$S = \int d^4x \left[g^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(-M^2 R - \frac{3M^2}{32}\frac{g^{\mu\nu}\nabla_\mu g \nabla_\nu g}{g^2} + \frac{1}{2}g^{\mu\nu}\nabla_\mu\Phi\nabla_\nu\Phi \right) - V(\Phi) \right] \tag{3.5}$$

so the energy-momentum tensor of the scalar field can be easily computed to be

$$\begin{aligned} T_{00} &= \frac{1}{2}\dot{\Phi}^2 + S^{-6}V(\Phi) && (3.6)\\ T_{ij} &= \left(\frac{1}{2}S^8\dot{\Phi}^2 - S^2V(\Phi)\right)\delta_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

and its traceless part, which is the source for the unimodular theory and thus does not depend on the potential $V(\Phi)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} T_{00}-\frac{1}{4}Tg_{00}&=\frac{3}{4}\dot{\Phi}^2 \\ T_{ij}-\frac{1}{4}Tg_{ij}&=\frac{1}{4}S^8\dot{\Phi}^2\delta_{ij} \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

The equations of motion for the scalar field that one derives from this action are the same as in General Relativity

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(S^6\dot{\Phi}\right)+V'(\Phi)=0 \tag{3.8}$$

if one assumes isotropy of the scalar field and thus $\partial_i\Phi=0$, where i denotes spatial directions. The Unimodular equations of motion, on their hand, read

$$G_{\mu\nu}-\frac{1}{4}Gg_{\mu\nu}=\frac{1}{2M^2}\left(T_{\mu\nu}-\frac{1}{4}Tg_{\mu\nu}\right) \tag{3.9}$$

which implies

$$\ddot{y}=-\frac{3}{4M^2}y\dot{\Phi}^2 \tag{3.10}$$

where $y=S^3$.

An important question arises here. When are this equations compatible with Einstein equations for General relativity? Or in other words, when do both theories happen to give the same results? It is plain that General Relativity[2] always implies the Unimodular theory, what can be easily checked by taking the trace of Einstein field equations

$$G_{\mu\nu}=\frac{1}{2M^2}T_{\mu\nu} \tag{3.11}$$

However, the converse is not true. In that case, one has to supplement the unimodular equations of motion with the further restriction that

$$G=\frac{1}{2M^2}T \tag{3.12}$$

in order to get the general relativistic equation of motion.

Besides that, it is well known that Bianchi identities do imply, even in the unimodular case, that

$$G-\frac{1}{2M^2}T=I \tag{3.13}$$

---

[2] We have to remark that we are always implicitely talking about General Relativity **without** any extra cosmological constant at all apart from the one that could arises from the scalar field vev.

where I is an arbitrary constant, determined by boundary conditions, that with our ansatz for the metric reads

$$I = 24S^4\dot{S}^2 + 6S^5\ddot{S} + \frac{1}{2M^2}\left(S^6\dot{\Phi}^2 - 4V(\Phi)\right) \tag{3.14}$$

Actually, this first integral is not more than a rescaling of the energy, since

$$I + \frac{2E}{M^2} \propto \ \mathbf{EM} = 0 \tag{3.15}$$

Therefore, in order to recover General Relativity, we must set I to nil, which is equivalent to choosing the subset of solutions of zero energy. Moreover, a fact that will become important later can be noted here. It is true that General Relativity is recovered by setting $I = E = 0$, however, since we can always shift the potential of the scalar field by a finite quantitie, which is ignored by the fact that the Unimodular theory does not account of vacuum energy, we can always relate any solution of the unimodular gravity to one of General Relativity just by finding the solution to Einstein equations in which we have modified the potential of the scalar field by adding $V_0 = -E$.

4. Constant scalar potential

With this relationship between General Relativity and Unimodular Gravity in mind, we are now interested in studying the possible relationship between the restriction $I = 0$ and the boundary conditions of the solutions to the equations of motion. Since the most remarkably difference between the two approachs (GR and U) arises when considering pure vacuum energy, we are going to analyze the situation in which $V(\Phi) = V_0 = constant$. With this choice, the equation of motion for the scalar field reads simply

$$S^6\dot{\Phi} = \Lambda^2 \tag{4.1}$$

where Λ is a constant with dimensions of mass that it related to a phyisical scale for the momentum of the field.

The gravitational equations of motion, on their hand, read

$$2\frac{\dot{S}^2}{S^2} + \frac{\ddot{S}}{S} = -\frac{\Lambda^4}{4M^2S^{12}} \tag{4.2}$$

(the spatial components ij do not yield anything new) that can be rewritten as

$$\frac{d}{dt}\left(S^2\dot{S}\right) = -\frac{\Lambda^4}{4M^2S^9} \tag{4.3}$$

When $\Lambda = 0$ we would conclude that a mass dimension one constant μ_0 must exist such that $\dot{S}S^2 = \mu_0/3$. Using now the Bernoulli method of variation of constants leads to the general solution of the equations of motion

$$S = \left(\frac{3\Lambda^4}{4\xi M^2}(t-t_0)^2 - \xi\right)^{\frac{1}{6}} \tag{4.4}$$

where ξ is a dimensionless constant in such a way that $\mu_0^2 \equiv \frac{3\Lambda^4}{4\xi M^2}$ is an energy scale, related to the scalar field total momentum. The scalar field, on its hand, reads

$$\Phi = \Phi_0 + \frac{M}{\sqrt{3}} \log\left(\frac{t - t_0 - \frac{\sqrt{\xi}}{\mu_0}}{t - t_0 + \frac{\sqrt{\xi}}{\mu_0}}\right) \tag{4.5}$$

With this solution, we can compute explicitely the curvature scalar, which reads

$$R = -\frac{4}{3}\frac{\mu_0^4(t-t_0)^2 + 6\mu_0^2\xi}{\mu_0^2(t-t_0)^2 - \xi} \tag{4.6}$$

and we can see that whenever $\Lambda \neq 0$, the scale factor vanishes and produces a curvature singularity when

$$t - t_0 = \pm t_s = \pm\frac{2\xi M}{\sqrt{3}\Lambda^2} = \pm\frac{\sqrt{\xi}}{\mu_0} \tag{4.7}$$

The only instance in which there is no singularity and we get a symmetric space-time is when $\xi = 0$, wich implies $R = -\frac{4}{3}\mu_0^2$ and the scale factor reduces to the one of a de Sitter space. On the other hand, the limit where $\Lambda \to 0$ has to be taken carefully. If one just set $\Lambda = 0$ and maintain every other parameter to not to vanish, the only allowed solution is flat space $S = S_0$. However, if we take the limit $\xi \to 0$ at the same time but maintaining $\mu_0 \neq 0$, there is another possible solution in the $\Lambda = 0$ regime, namely

$$S = (\mu_0(t-t_0))^{\frac{1}{3}} \tag{4.8}$$

where now μ_0 is an independent constant and the solution clearly corresponds to a maximally symmetric space, which appears due to the fact, noted on section 2, that maximally symmetric spaces are all of them solutions of the vacuum equations of motion in the unimodular frame.

Now that we have a solution to the equations of motion, we are interested, as we said before, in analyzing the relationship between the restriction $I = 0$ that maps the unimodular theory into General Relativity and the boundary conditions that determine the values of μ_0, Λ and ξ of our solution. The most instructive way to do that is to compute I without assuming any relationship between μ_0 and Λ. This yields

$$I = \frac{4}{3}\mu_0^2 - \frac{2V_0}{M^2} + \frac{\left(\frac{\Lambda^4}{2M^2} - \frac{2\mu_0^2}{3}\xi^2\right)}{S^6} \tag{4.9}$$

So there are now two disctinct possibilities to set $I = 0$

- Either $\Lambda = \xi = 0$, in which case the scalar field gets vanishing momentum and the constant μ_0 is not related to Λ, but rather to the strength of the potential, $\mu_0^2 = \frac{3V_0}{2M^2}$. The scale factor in this case is

  $$S = (\mu_0 (t - t_0))^{\frac{1}{3}} \tag{4.10}$$

  This is de Sitter space in disguise, because the curvature scalar reads

  $$R = -\frac{4}{3}\mu_0^2 = -\frac{2V_0}{M^2} \tag{4.11}$$

  (this assumes $V_0 > 0$; otherwise it is an anti-de Sitter).

- The other possibility is that

  $$\mu_0^2 = \frac{3\Lambda^4}{4\xi^2 M^2} = \frac{3V_0}{2M^2} \tag{4.12}$$

  This corresponds to an scalar field with nonvanishing momentum (kinetic energy) proportional to the strength of the potential. Consistency then demands that the constant

  $$\xi = 1 \tag{4.13}$$

Let us note at this point that the vacuum expectation value of the potential does not appears in any part of the solution more than in selecting boundary conditions, so any change on the vacuum energy vacuum along the time does not affect the unimodular equations of motion.

Imagine, then, that we want to make a crude model of the gravitational effect produced by a sudden raise of the vacuum energy. To be specific, we assume that at unimodular time $t = T$ there is a discontinuity such that

$$\begin{aligned} V(\Phi) &= 0 \qquad t - t_0 < T \\ V(\Phi) &= V_0 \qquad t - t_0 \geq T \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

In the unimodular case, as we have just noted, nothing changes; physical quantities are insensitive to the value of V_0. Let us examine, however, the situation in GR, in which matching conditions at both sides of the $t - t_0 = T$ hypersurface impose[3]

$$\begin{aligned} &[h_{ij}] = -S^2\delta_{ij} \\ &[K_{ij}] = -S^4\dot{S}\delta_{ij} = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

which amount in this case to

$$[S] = [\dot{S}] = 0 \tag{4.17}$$

that is, both the scale factor and its derivative have got to be continuous at $t - t_0 = T$. Now for $t - t_0 \leq T$ the solution corresponds to flat space

$$S_-(t) = 1 \tag{4.18}$$

whereas for $t - t_0 \geq T$

$$S_+(t) = \left(\mu_0\,(t - t_0)\right)^{\frac{1}{3}} \tag{4.19}$$

where $\mu_0^2 = \frac{3V_0}{2M}$ and continuity of the scale factor imposes $T - t_0 = \sqrt{\frac{2M}{3V_0}}$. This in turn means that the derivative $\dot{S}$ diverges at $t = T$, so that the matching is not possible with the general relativistic solution as above, and one is forced to postulate the existence of a thin shell [5] at $t - t_0 = T$ with energy-momentum tensor

$$S_{ij} \sim S^4\dot{S}\delta_{ij} \sim \sqrt{\frac{V_0}{6M^2}}\delta_{ij} \tag{4.20}$$

This is not very satisfactory. Nevertheless it is clearly seen through this computation that a sudden jump in the scalar field potential up to a constant value does not affect the unimodular theory, whereas it produces a *cosmological constant* term in GR.

5. Conclusions

Some cosmological solutions of the equations of motion of the unimodular theory of gravity have been examined in the unimodular frame where the EM streamline greatly. It is always possible to shift a general relativistic scalar potential by a

---

[3] We shall represent quantities defined for $t - t_0 \geq T$ by the superscript $+$, and those defined for $t < T$ by the superscript $-$. We also denote the difference of a physical quantity M between both sides of the hypersurface defined by $t - t_0 = T$ by

$$[M] \equiv M^+ - M^- \tag{4.15}$$

constant so that the unimodular solution is a solution of general relativity as well, also expresssed in the unimodular frame.

It is a physically relevant fact, however, that a constant potential does not (neccessarily) gravitate. If in particular a *gedankenexperiment* is performed in which the scalar potential vanishes until at a given time it is raised to a constant value, then the unimodular theory admits a flat space solution valid for all time, in contradistinction to what happens in general relativity, where a dynamical thin shell is necessary to avoid singularities. This fact, sometimes dismissed as unimportant, seems to us quite relevant.

A clarifying observation is the following. It is possible to substitute directly the unimodular ansatz in the action before deriving the EM which in the minisuperspace are ODE for the two functions of one variable $S(t)$ and $\Phi(t)$. That is

$$S = \int dt \left(-6M^2 S^4 \dot{S}^2 + \frac{1}{2} S^6 \dot{\Phi}^2 - V(\Phi) \right) \tag{5.1}$$

The variational principle leads to

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\left(S^6 \dot{\Phi}\right) + V'(\Phi) = 0 \\ &-8S^3 \dot{S}^2 - 4S^4 \ddot{S} = \frac{1}{M^2} S^5 \dot{\Phi}^2 \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

which are equivalent to the unimodular EM as derived in the paper. It also yields the expression for the energy as a first integral

$$E \equiv -6M^2 S^4 \dot{S}^2 + \frac{1}{2} S^6 \dot{\Phi}^2 + V(\Phi) \tag{5.3}$$

If the same exercise is performed for the Einstein-Hilbert action of GR one easily finds that the variational principle is *exactly* the same. The reason is that the cosmological constant does not gravitate in this frame.

It would be most interesting to study the role of these constant shifts in the scalar potential in a putative supersymmetric [4] version of the theory.

Acknowledgments

We have enjoyed many discussions with Luis Alvarez-Gaumé. This work has been partially supported by the European Union FP7 ITN INVISIBLES (Marie Curie Actions, PITN- GA-2011- 289442)and (HPRN-CT-200-00148) as well as by FPA2009-

09017 (DGI del MCyT, Spain) and S2009ESP-1473 (CA Madrid). The authors acknowledge the support of the Spanish MINECOs Centro de Excelencia Severo Ochoa Programme under grant SEV-2012-0249.

References

[1] E. Alvarez and M. Herrero-Valea, “Unimodular gravity with external sources,” arXiv:1209.6223 [hep-th].

[2] E. Alvarez and A. F. Faedo, “Unimodular cosmology and the weight of energy,” Phys. Rev. D **76**, 064013 (2007) [hep-th/0702184].

[3] D. Blas, M. Shaposhnikov and D. Zenhausern, “Scale-invariant alternatives to general relativity,” Phys. Rev. D **84**, 044001 (2011) [arXiv:1104.1392 [hep-th]].
B. Fiol and J. Garriga, “Semiclassical Unimodular Gravity,” JCAP **1008**, 015 (2010) [arXiv:0809.1371 [hep-th]].
P. Jain, A. Jaiswal, P. Karmakar, G. Kashyap and N. K. Singh, “Cosmological implications of unimodular gravity,” JCAP **1211**, 003 (2012) [arXiv:1109.0169 [astro-ph.CO]].
M. Shaposhnikov and D. Zenhausern, “Scale invariance, unimodular gravity and dark energy,” Phys. Lett. B **671**, 187 (2009) [arXiv:0809.3395 [hep-th]].

[4] H. Nishino and S. Rajpoot, “Unimodular supergravity,” Phys. Lett. B **528**, 259 (2002) [hep-th/0107202].

[5] E. Poisson, ”A Relativist’s Toolkit” (Cambridge, 2004)

HEP :: Search :: Help Powered by Invenio v1.0.0-rc0+ Problems/Questions to feedback@inspirehep.net